UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/850,184	05/07/2001	Randy Buswell	Wyse-006	9750

31824   7590   05/24/2005

MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP
18191 VON KARMAN AVE.
IRVINE, CA 92612-7107

EXAMINER
BATES, KEVIN T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

DATE MAILED: 05/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/850,184	BUSWELL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Kevin Bates	2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _28 February 2005_.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _26-43_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _26-43_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is in response to a communication made on February 28,

2005.

Claims 26 – 43 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by
another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent
granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the
applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section
351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States
only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2)
of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 26, 29-31, 33-38, and 40-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as

being anticipated by Capps (6735691).

Regarding claim 26, Capps discloses a management system for managing

configuration information (Column 2, lines 3 – 5) for one or more thin clients in a thin

client network (Column 3, lines 48 – 53), comprising: a management application for

pulling a master registry containing configuration information from a first device and for

pushing the master registry to a thin client via the thin client network (Column 7, lines 58

– 67); a software repository for storing the master registry pulled from the first device

(Column 8, lines 16 – 22); and a transport mechanism for transporting the master

registry from the first device to the software repository and from the software repository

to the thin client (Column 8, lines 23 – 35).

Regarding claim 29, Capps discloses that the first device is a thin client

connected to the thin client network (Column 3, lines 48 – 55).

Regarding claim 30, Capps discloses that the first device is a non-native terminal (Column 3, lines 48 – 50).

Regarding claim 31, Capps discloses a network management tool for managing devices connected to the thin client network, wherein the network management tool is used by the management application to trigger the transport mechanism (Column 3, lines 56 – 62).

Regarding claim 33, Capps discloses that the master registry stored on the first device is configurable using the network management tool (Column 7, lines 45 – 56).

Regarding claim 34, Capps discloses that the master registry stored on the first device is configurable using a native user interface provided on the first device (Column 7, lines 45 – 56).

Regarding claim 35, Capps discloses a Virtual Network Computing client for configuring the master registry stored on the first device via a Virtual Network Computing server provided on the first device (Column 2, lines 37 – 44).

Regarding claim 36, Capps discloses a browser for configuring the master registry stored on the first device via a Hyper-Text Markup Language server provided on the first device (Column 5, lines 51 – 59; Column 7, lines 45 – 50).

Regarding claim 37, Capps discloses that the master registry includes a plurality of individually addressable fields (Column 7, lines 45 – 56).

Regarding claim 38, Capps discloses that the management application is capable of pushing the master registry to a plurality of thin clients successively (Column 8, lines 23 – 35).

Regarding claim 40, Capps discloses that the master registry is merged with a

current registry of the thin client to create a merged thin client device registry (Column

8, lines 31 – 43).

Regarding claim 41, Capps discloses that the registry is combined with a binary

stored in the software repository prior to being pushed to the thin client (Column 7, lines

58 – 67).

Regarding claim 42, Capps discloses that the registry pushed to the thin client

upgrades a current registry on the thin client (Column 8, lines 23 – 35).

Regarding claim 43, Capps discloses that the management application pushes

the registry from the thin client to another thin client (Column 8, lines 23 – 35).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Capps in view of Dean (6202206).

Regarding claim 39, Capps does not explicitly indicate the management

application is capable of pushing the master registry to a plurality of thin clients

simultaneously. Dean teaches configuring many selected client computers in the same

network at once using a server to distribute information based on configure files

(Column 5, lines 47 – 53; Column 6, lines 10 – 14; Column 10, lines 35 – 42). It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to use Dean's teaching of distributing configuration information to many clients at once

in Capps configuration migration system in order to allow many global configuration

upgrades and computer installation in a short amount of time to reduce downtime

(Column 1, lines 50 – 67).

Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Capps in view of Carcerano (6308205).

Regarding the claim 32, Capps does not explicitly indicate that network

management tool is a Simple Network Management Protocol tool. Carcerano teaches a

system that monitors and updates configuration information in devices, such as thin

clients (Column 5, lines 13 – 20; Column 2, lines 13 – 26) and part of that teaching,

Carcerano discloses using SNMP for communication between the clients and the

servers (Column 9, lines 3 – 22). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made to use SNMP to communicate and trigger the

transfer mechanism in Capps system because SNMP is allows the servers to view and

update configurations of network devices without using excess traffic burdens (Column

1, lines 56 – 59).

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Capps in view of Sandahl (6098098).

Regarding claim 27, Capps does not explicitly indicate that the transport

mechanism uses a File Transport Protocol. Sandahl teaches sending configuration

information to devices through FTP (Column 8, lines 24 – 27). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use

Sandahl's teachings of using FTP in a network in Capps' system in order to allow a file

server which uses FTP transport to use be able to send configuration files to devices

(Column 8, lines 19 – 31).

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Capps in view of Hansen (5819042).

Regarding claim 28, Capps does not explicitly indicate that the transport

mechanism uses a Trivial File Transport Protocol. Hansen teaches sending

configuration information to devices through TFTP (Column 6, lines 31 – 49). It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to use Hansen's teaching of TFTP to configure network devices in Capps' system in

order to transfer the configuration files during the boot up of the system (Column 6, lines

31 – 49).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed February 28, 2005 have been fully considered but

they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that the reference, Capps, does not disclose pulling

information from the first device and pushing the registry information to the thin client.

The examiner disagrees, as seen on Column 7, lines 58 – 67, the reference discloses

the server/management device actively searching and retrieving information located on

the first device to build the migration file on the server, thus it is pulling information from

the device." Seen on Column 8, lines 23 – 35, once the user prompts the server to

migrate in information to the destination the server takes the migration file and uses it to

modify the configuration information on the client thus pushing the information onto the

client.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Kevin Bates whose telephone number is (571) 272-

3980. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KB

KB
May 18, 2005

ARIO ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100